

## REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in person interview held on August 2, 2006 with Applicants' representatives. During the interview, proposed amendments to the independent claims were discussed, as well as the cited art and rejections of record. It was concluded that the proposed amendments appeared to productively advance the claims over the claims as previously presented; however, the Examiner reserved the right to perform an additional review of the cited prior art and conduct an additional search, as necessary. Accordingly, the claims as presented herein reflect the proposed amendments as discussed, and entry is respectfully requested. Specifically, independent claims 27 and 43 have been amended, together with dependent claim 55, while new dependent claims 56 and 57 have been added.<sup>1</sup>

The non-final Office Action, mailed June 5, 2006, considered claims 27-55. Claims 27-34, 37-41, 43-49, 51-53 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Universal Plug and Play Device Architecture* (hereinafter "UPnP Architecture"), in view of Kekic (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,537). Claims 35, 36, 42, 50 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over UPnP Architecture in view of Kekic, and further in view of the Microsoft Word 2000 application.<sup>2</sup>

As discussed during the interview, the claimed embodiments of the present invention are directed to discovering, controlling and displaying UPnP devices for a system. As recited in claim 27, for example, a generic user control tool includes a user interface that displays, in a first window panel: (i) a plurality of user-selectable device search fields that each corresponds to a different type of search; and (ii) a device properties search field that displays properties associated with UPnP devices. The properties are determined and displayed by utilizing at least one file that contains property information for the devices and which corresponds to a device search field. When a search type field and device property in the device properties field are selected, the generic user control point tool collects UPnP device information and displays that information as a list of selectable UPnP devices at the first window panel of the user interface. Independent claim 43 is directed to a method for displaying a user interface generally corresponding to the user interface of claim 27.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. For example, the "client graphical user interface", the MIB browser, and the auto-discovery panel as taught by Kekic fail, whether alone or in combination, to

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found, by way of example and not representation, in the disclosure found on p. 14, line 10 through p. 16, line 6, and in Figure 2 of Applicants' original disclosure.

<sup>2</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should the need arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

teach or suggest, among other things, a user interface that displays a device properties search field that displays to the user a plurality of user-selectable UPnP device properties, and in which the properties are determined by accessing a file containing device properties corresponding to a particular type of selected search and displayed by the user interface in response to user selection of a user-selectable device search field corresponding to the particular type of search type, as claimed in combination with the other recited elements. In contrast, an auto-discovery panel 2700 (*see, e.g.* Fig. 27 of Kekic) appears to illustrate three fields, namely an IP Address field, a Limited Search field, and a Read Community field. In the IP Address field and Read Community fields, a user can type in an IP address or type of read community, respectively. (Col. 43, ln. 43 to Col. 44, ln. 57; Fig. 27). The Limited Search field allows a user to select between a limited search (corresponding to user selection of a "Yes" option) or a non-limited search (corresponding to user selection of a "No" option).

While Kekic discloses the use of these various fields, Kekic appears to disclose that only the Limited Search field includes different types of searches to perform. Moreover, Kekic fails to teach or suggest any other field which, in response to selection of a type of search, determines and displays properties associated with a UPnP device by utilizing a file corresponding to a particular type of search selected by the user in the user interface, as recited in combination with the other claimed elements of Applicants' invention.

The other cited art also fails to teach or suggest such a generic user control point tool having a user interface as recited in the claims. In fact, with regard to the other art, the Office Action acknowledges that the UPnP Architecture document "does not explicitly describe user interface features for discovering and controlling such devices." (Office Action, p. 5). Accordingly, and for at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the others discussed during the interview, UPnP Architecture and Kekic fail to teach or suggest a user interface as claimed by Applicants invention.

Although the foregoing arguments are specifically related to claims 27 and 42, it will be appreciated that, for at least the foregoing reasons, all of the other rejections and assertions of record with respect to the dependent claims are now moot, particularly when considering the combination with elements recited in the corresponding independent claims.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the dependent claims need not be addressed individually.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, and as previously noted, Applicants note that they do not acquiesce to the assertions made of record in the Office Action. For example, among other assertions, Applicants disagree with the characterization that setting the value of a variable "meets the limitation of "displaying a selectable list of actions that can be invoked", as recited in claim 40.

<sup>4</sup> It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 27-57 are neither anticipated by nor made obvious in view of the cited art of record. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:crb  
AHY0000001295V001

---

or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.